

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

M

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO         |  |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 10/071,368  | 02/08/2002  | Ryusuke Hasegawa     | H0002699 (4710)         | 1788                    |  |
| 7590 12/06/2005   |             |                      | EXAMINER                |                         |  |
| Staas & Halsy LLP   |             |                      | NGUYEN, TUYEN T         |                         |  |
| 1201 New York Avenue, N.W. Suite 700 Washington, DC 20005 |             |                      | ART UNIT                | DARER NUMBER            |  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER            |  |
|   |             |                      | 2832                    |                         |  |
|   |             |                      | DATE MAILED: 12/06/2005 | DATE MAILED: 12/06/2005 |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)    |  |  |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 10/071,368      | HASEGAWA ET AL. |  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit        |  |  |
| TUYEN T. NGUYEN | 2832            |  |  |

| zororo uro r milg or urr rippour ziror  | Examiner  | Art Unit  |  |
|---|---|---|--|
|   | TUYEN T. NGUYEN   | 2832  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ears on the cover sheet with the c  | correspondence add                                  | ress                                       |
| THE REPLY FILED 09 November 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS  | S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F  | OR ALLOWANCE.                                       |  |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:  | wing replies: (1) an amendment, affortice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in one with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu            | idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C        | nce, which<br>FR 41.31; or (3)             |
| <ul> <li>a)</li></ul>   | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth  | •   |  |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7   | (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE  | •   |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origin than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi | iate extension fee<br>ce action; or (2) as |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp<br/>filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte<br/>a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>   | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of th                               |  |
| AMENDMENTS  |   |   |  |
| <ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further co</li> </ol>   |   |   | ecause                                     |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  | •   | i E below),   |  |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or  | • •   | ducing or simplifying                               | the issues for                             |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a  | corresponding number of finally rej   | ected claims.                                       |  |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1   | 16 and 41.33(a)).   |   |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1   | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co   | mpliant Amendment                                   | (PTOL-324).                                |
| <ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li></ol>   |   |   |  |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>   |   |   |  |
| 7. Solution For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is profit The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:  |   | ll be entered and an e                              | explanation of                             |
| Claim(s) objected to:<br>Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4,5,7,8 and 11-13</u> .  |   |   |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |   |   |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |   |   |  |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).   | _   |   | <del></del>                                |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of<br>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar   | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appear<br>y and was not earlier presented. S                                       | al and/or appellant fai<br>ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(      | ls to provide a 1).                        |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  | n of the status of the claims after e   | ntry is below or attach                             | ned.                                       |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu  | it does NOT place the application in  | n condition for allowa                              | nce because:                               |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:  | (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N   | lo(s)   |  |
|   |   | Tengla N  | guylu                                      |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's newly amended feature of a non-gapped core would require further search and/or reconsideration.